

REMARKS

Claims 8-13, 19, 21, and 28-36 are presented for further examination. Claims 8, 19, 28, and 32 have been amended. Claim 36 is new.

In the Office Action mailed June 15, 2009, the Examiner stated that the amendment submitted with respect to “growth” of the epitaxial layer is a process limitation that is not considered in claims directed to structure. Thus, the “epitaxial layer of semiconductor material” of layer 14 of Mirza et al. was found to anticipate independent claims 28 and 32. Claims 28, 29, 32, and 33 were then rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Mirza et al. Claims 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Sidner et al. in view of Mirza et al. Claims 30, 31, 34, and 35 were rejected as obvious over Mirza et al. in view of Beyer et al. Claims 19 and 21 were rejected as obvious over Mirza et al. in view of Sidner et al.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and further examination of the claims.

Claim Rejections

In a telephone conference with the Examiner on July 23, 2009, the undersigned proposed having the claims amended to recite the membrane being “integral” with the substrate and not bonded. The Examiner indicated that a recitation of “integral” would overcome the description of Mirza because the recitation of “integral” is not directed to a process of growing.

In view of the foregoing, applicants have amended claims 8, 19, 28, and 32 to recite an epitaxial layer or a membrane that is integral with the substrate formed of monolithic semiconductor material. In view of the prior discussion with the Examiner, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 8, 19, 28, and 32 are now in condition for allowance as are their respective dependent claims.

New dependent claim 36 depends from claim 8 and recites the coating being in the range of 60 nanometers to 100 nanometers. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 36 is neither suggested nor taught by Mirza et al. or any of the other references cited by the Examiner. Thus, claim 36 is allowable for this feature as well as for the reasons why claim 8 is allowable.

Application No. 10/667,113
Reply to Office Action dated June 15, 2009

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims remaining in this application are in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner disagrees or finds minor informalities that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned by telephone at (206) 622-4900 in order to expeditiously resolve prosecution of this application. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing this case to issuance is respectfully solicited.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Respectfully submitted,
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/E. Russell Tarleton/
E. Russell Tarleton
Registration No. 31,800

ERT:jl

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400
Seattle, Washington 98104
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

1464939_1.DOC